## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

:

In re: FLONASE ANTITRUST : CIVIL ACTION

LITIGATION, :

NO. 08-CV-3301

:

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

Indirect Purchaser Actions

## **ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this \_\_26th\_ day of September 2011, in considering Defendant's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 180), it is **ORDERED**:

- Defendant's motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters' monopolization and unjust enrichment claims under Arizona law is
   DENIED.
- Defendant's motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters' monopolization and unjust enrichment claims under Wisconsin law is
   DENIED.
- Defendant's motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiffs AFL
  and IBEW's unfair and deceptive trade practices claim under Florida law
  is **DENIED**.
- Defendant's motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff
   IABORI's monopolization and unfair and deceptive trade practices claims
   under North Carolina law is GRANTED.
- Defendant's motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters'

monopolization and unjust enrichment claims under Iowa law is **GRANTED**.

- Defendant's motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters' unfair and deceptive trade practices claim under Florida law is **GRANTED**.
- Defendant's motion for summary judgment as to named plaintiff Painters'
  unfair and deceptive trade practices claim under Arizona law is
  GRANTED.

s/Anita B. Brody
ANITA B. BRODY, J.

Copies VIA ECF on	to:	Copies <b>MAILED</b> on	to